

A MARKET SURVEY OF FOOD SERVICE NEEDS
IN MANHATTAN, KANSAS

by

LARRY PAIGE BILOTTA

B. S., Kansas State University, 1962

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Institutional Management

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:

David B. Shugart
Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1968
B55
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	2
Dining-out Habits and Attitudes of the Consumers	2
Attitudes Towards Restaurants	6
Service	8
Atmosphere	10
Respondent Classification	13
PROCEDURE	14
Selection of Respondents	15
Statistical Analysis	16
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	16
Frequency of Dining Out	18
Opinions of Present Facilities	18
Meal Prices	21
Desired Food Service Facilities	22
Service of Alcoholic and Cereal Malt Beverages	28
Characteristics of a Good Eating Establishment	28
Statistical Significance	30
SUMMARY	31
CONCLUSIONS	34
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	36
LITERATURE CITED	37
APPENDIX A	39
APPENDIX B	46

LIST OF TABLES

1. Age, marital status, and income of respondents	17
2. Average number of meals eaten out per month	19
3. Opinions of present food service facilities	20
4. Maximum price respondents are willing to pay for meals	23
5. Kinds of additional food service facilities desired in Manhattan	24
6. Service of alcoholic and cereal malt beverages	28
7. Characteristics of a good food service	29

INTRODUCTION

Americans today eat one out of every five meals outside the home. This market now constitutes at least 20 billion dollars of the 80 billion that consumers spend yearly for food. Within the next 40 years, Porter (1963) believes that the food service industry will catch up with, and then pass, the home feeding field. "We are fast reaching the point where we will eat 50% of our meals institutionally, or out of the home," continues Porter.

According to Levy (1956), dining out is a complex social event, with many psychological gratifications. It involves showing off and looking for new ways of behaving, new experiences both social and sensory, and relaxation of self control. This description of dining out can be applied to both social and business meals that are consumed today.

Eating out is growing in importance for both the restaurant industry and the consumer. The restaurant owner and manager must be aware of the desires and needs of his market. According to Baum (1965), management must match the restaurant to it's customers' wants so that there can be a totality of concept and execution. Customers are demanding better performance and a better product. In the restaurant industry, the product is food, service and atmosphere--this constitutes the "total restaurant" (Baum, 1965).

To find out what the market wants in the way of a "total restaurant," a marketing program must be developed. Stanton (1964) described a sound marketing program as one that should

start with a careful quantitative and qualitative analysis of the market demand for the product and service.

According to Backstrom (1963), no enlightened businessman today would consider executing a policy or decision or implementing a long-range program without a substantial "basis of intelligence" with which to support his judgment. One way to obtain this "basis of intelligence" is to survey the Market.

Although some studies of dining-out habits and attitudes of the food service market have been made on a national scale, nothing has been done to obtain this information in the community of Manhattan, Kansas. A need for such a local consumer survey was suggested during interviews with the Executive Manager of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce and the Director of the Kansas State University Endowment Association.

The purpose of this study was to determine what is wanted and/or needed by the residents of the City of Manhattan in dining facilities, excluding drive-in establishments.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Dining-out Habits and Attitudes of the Consumer

In a survey conducted by the Research Department of the J. Walter Thompson Company for the National Restaurant Association (1964), attitudes of the consumer toward eating out were studied. Information was obtained through discussions by panel members living either in the city or nearby suburbs on: when, where, and why people eat out; what they enjoy about eating out; what effect

children have on their eating out; why they don't eat out more often; and what their attitudes are about restaurants in general. Results indicated that with few exceptions, people's reaction to eating out remained quite stable from group to group, regardless of their socio-economic class, the age of the children, or any other variables.

The discussions pointed out that people don't eat out to get away from the house for a meal, but rather as a special event. They try to find new places to dine. Depending on the occasion or the amount of time available, they would drive as much as 30 miles to a specific restaurant. According to the Thompson report:

If just the husband and wife went out for an evening by themselves they will tend to go to a 'pretty nice' place, that is, one where they can have a drink if they care to and order a fairly expensive meal--perhaps steak or seafood that costs \$4.00 or so per person. If the children are along, this calls for a different type of establishment and on these occasions a pancake house or restaurants specializing in hamburgers or pizza are called for.

Participants in the Thompson report were asked "Which is more important the food or the service?" Both men and women tended to give equal importance to food and service, with atmosphere running close behind.

The majority of respondents in a metropolitan area of Boston, surveyed by Gilden and Labson (1963), believed that restaurants were not providing food, service, and atmosphere in the proper balance.

A deterrent to eating out, according to Levy (1956), is that it takes too much energy. After a hard day's work, few people are willing to put out this "extra effort." Young people are

the ones most likely to expend this energy, especially single people in the dating process. Dining gives them an opportunity to display their social skills and try to impress their dates. After marriage, this need declines and eating out becomes an event for special occasions. The frequency of dining out again drops after the arrival of the first child. A married couple with children find two obstacles: the cost and inconvenience of taking the children or finding a baby sitter.

In the later years, eating out becomes more frequent but is resisted by the housewife, who feels much more comfortable and secure in the familiar surroundings of her home. She also is weary of restaurant ingredients, cleanliness, and cost. She does not like the implication that others can substitute for her culinary skills (J. Walter Thompson Company, 1964).

In a survey by General Foods (1962), adults were asked to express preferences for dining out or eating at home on special occasions. On only four events from a list of 22, did the majority of respondents favor eating out: wedding anniversary, 57% preferred to eat out and 20% at home; spouse's birthday, 44% favored eating out while 29% liked to eat at home; Mother's Day, 39% favored dining out to 35% in favor of eating at home; and after a cocktail party where 24% favored eating out and 23% wanted to eat at home.

The General Foods Studies (1960 and 1962) showed that approximately 10% of the meals purchased were for business reasons and were likely to be noon or breakfast meals and on week days.

Availability of alcoholic beverages appeared in the Thompson study (1964) to be considerably more important for business meals than for non-business meals, particularly at noon. Business meals were more likely to be eaten where liquor was available, and the selection of the restaurant was influenced by the availability of liquor more often than for non-business meals.

Many reasons for eating out, given by families, in the Thompson study (1964), had little to do with food per se or the pleasures of dining. The motives cited most often were:

- The family is away from home shopping, going to the doctor, out for a drive, attending the movies, etc., and decides to eat a main meal out.

- The family dines out for a special occasion, the celebration of a family birthday or anniversary, for example.

- The family dines out because of convenience or necessity, such as having a house guest, in process of moving, having the interior of the house painted, etc.

- The family wants a change of routine; the housewife wants to relax, get away from cooking for a while.

- The family is out of town on a trip.

- The family plans on dining out as a social occasion with an informal group, a get-together with friends.

Results of a study by General Foods Corporation (1960) indicated that two fifths of all meals eaten out were voluntary and three fifths were "captive" meals. Another study by General Foods (1963) showed that from 1960 to 1963 the number of voluntary meals versus "captive" meals had increased by 6%. This would indicate that more concern should be given by the industry to satisfying the wants and desires of the market.

A comparison of the two General Foods' surveys showed a 1% increase in breakfasts in 1963, a 1% increase in noon meals, and a 4% increase in the evening meals. The breakdown of meals eaten out by respondents in the 1963 survey was: breakfast, 6%; noon meal, 31%; and evening meal, 29%. The results were obtained by asking respondents if they had dined out during the previous week.

In the 1963 study, the largest factor affecting the increase of meals eaten out was attributed to women. In 1960, 38% had eaten out during the previous week; in 1963, the number increased to 48%. However, the average number of meals eaten out, based on replies from all respondents, was 1.5, exactly the same as in the 1960 study.

Although the number of meals eaten out per respondent (1.5) did not change between 1960 and 1963, the number of persons over the age of 18 years did increase. On the basis of the United States population 18 years of age and older, there were 57.3 million meals eaten out during the week in question. This was an increase of 9.1 million meals a week in less than a three-year span.

Attitudes Toward Restaurants

According to the J. Walter Thompson Company (1964), when families do decide to eat out, more than 50% of the time they prefer restaurants to cafeterias, diners, drive-ins, or hotels. This seems to hold true regardless of the differences in family

characteristics. In large cities, the restaurant is important for main meal dining, accounting for 75% of family meals eaten out. The restaurant also maintains its majority status in the smaller cities. In communities of 50,000 to 450,000, cafeterias account for 20% of the main meals served. Hotels are important in the small and rural communities.

Major complaints of housewives concerning restaurants, as indicated in a consumer survey by Standard Brands (1958), were:

- Poor and slow service
- Expensiveness
- Lack of cleanliness
- Crowds
- Noise and other physical conditions
- Poor quality of food

Suggested improvements for restaurants were, in ranked order:

- More cleanliness
- Better accommodations
- Less noise and other physical improvements
- Better food
- Faster and prompter service
- More courteous and efficient employees
- More reasonable prices

Adult respondents in the General Foods survey (1960) listed characteristics of a good restaurant in this order: (1) food, (2) appearance and atmosphere, (3) service, and (4) prices. When asked about what restaurants should do to increase their business, their answers were grouped in the following categories: service, food, appearance and atmosphere, and prices.

Respondents in the Thompson survey (1964) were asked to indicate factors that kept them from eating out. No one deterrent

received more than 50% "yes" votes. Those with the most votes, in rank order were:

- having to wait to be seated;
- the household budget leaves no room to eat out more often;
- prices charged;
- meals at home taste better;
- noise in eating places;
- eating places are not as clean as they should be;
- have to dress up;
- distance you have to go to a good restaurant;
- the nuisance of dining out;
- can't get the food I like;
- people who serve you are not pleasant enough;
- our small children are a problem.

Davis (1964) conducted a survey of 80 female office employees on the campus of Kansas State University to determine lunch preferences and buying habits. Factors most influencing the selection of a restaurant or cafeteria as a place to purchase lunches were: convenient location, cleanliness, and food quality. Attitudes toward purchased meals varied, but more than 50% of respondents interviewed expressed a preference for food prepared at home.

Although poor service was a major complaint, Greenaway (1964) believes there is little indication that the market will favor restaurants that completely automate their services and eliminate personalized attention from waiters and waitresses.

Service

A Gallup poll (1962) to determine factors considered important by the American Public when dining out revealed that three of the top five pertained to service. Consumers apparently

considered dining out to be a recreational experience rather than a convenience or a necessity.

The 5% of the market who really like to dine when they eat out patronize the speciality restaurants where today's food and service are far better than those of ten years ago (Warfield, 1965).

An 18% vote for waiters instead of waitresses in the Gallup poll (1962) indicated that the male service personnel may have lost its appeal as a restaurant status symbol. Today's operators realize that the front-of-the-house service people, whether male or female, should be courteous, attentive, and competent according to Gallup (1962). Good service no longer is a luxury, but a necessity.

According to Hoffland (1962), the enjoyment of eating out is derived through the things that please all of the senses--smell, taste, touch, sight, and sound. If something about a waitress or her service irritates one of these senses, it naturally decreases the total enjoyment of the meal.

Four traits of a good waiter or waitress were listed in Past Food Magazine (Anon., 1965):

1. An ability to get along with co-workers.
2. The common sense to know that their take-home pay is directly related to their abilities to transmit a cheerful, pleasing personality.
3. A desire to see the house make money.
4. A belief that the food they are serving is really good food.

In good service, Szathmary (1956) believes that every detail counts: helping with coats, explaining patiently the details of the menu, showing a personal interest without over-friendliness, and impeccable techniques in serving. He uses service as a merchandising technique in his Chicago restaurant. He commented:

During the dinner hours, my wife and I go from table to table talking to every one of our guests. Many return regularly. The first year over 30,000 meals were served to only 8,000 guests.

When a customer enters the Bakery, the hostess seats him, introduces the waiter to the guests and the guests to the waiter. This has been a valuable technique in personalizing service.

Atmosphere

The J. Walter Thompson report (1964) pointed out that while it was difficult to get people to pinpoint a general definition for "good atmosphere," they did have some specific things to say when they talked about "nice restaurants." Besides good service, they mentioned a place that was quiet, had soft lighting, and a certain amount of privacy and leisure during their meal. The report stated that:

Noise, bright lights, crowded tables, excessive hustle and (in the summer time) air conditioning that was up too high, were mentioned as things which can spoil an otherwise pleasant meal.

Motto (1965) defined atmosphere as

the surrounding influence of an establishment, its aesthetic tone and mood, and the harmony of effects upon the beholder. Atmosphere should be keyed to your market, your guests. It should attract your guests and make them comfortable.

According to Howard (1965), the food service retailing industry has come of age and fully integrated marketing is no longer a "text book concept," it is a way of life in today's restaurant business. It has been developed to cope with the eating-away-from-home public's ravenous "second appetite for something different."

Every restaurant has an atmosphere, but the question is, "Does this atmosphere augment or detract from the menu?" (Anon., 1965).

According to Motto (1965), a theme should be created to establish a vital personality for the restaurant. She further stated:

People today are sophisticated and, due to jet travel, have been guests in hotels, motor-inns, lodges, clubs, and speciality restaurants all over the world.

"Design," according to Motto (1965), is "the arrangement of details which make up a work of art." She further commented that design has to do with space, either two or three dimensional.

The design of an establishment, according to Motto, involves the over-all detail: structural, electrical, mechanical, and the arrangement of furniture and furnishings. Designing an area or room requires knowledge of architecture, construction, lighting, color, furnishing, fabrics, finishes, and space relationships.

Without studied design and applied appropriate decor, it is impossible to achieve a merchandising atmosphere. Motto (1965) tells the restaurateur to:

Know your market and key your interior design to develop an atmosphere that will please your guests, excite their interests and make them want to return.

According to Feder (1965), atmosphere is an intangible that has many of the same characteristics as light. "It can't be held or touched," he further stated,

but you can walk in it; talk in it; or live, love and hate in it; and spend money in it; all without disturbing it. Atmosphere fills space without taking up room. It creates moods, can be charming or unpleasant, exciting or quiescent. It is elusive and unique.

Varney (1965) stated that atmosphere must be imaginative. When people dine out, they want to pay for something different.

Lighting is an important factor in creating atmosphere, but it also is a controversial subject. According to Feder (1965):

Almost every restaurateur has his own opinion about lighting; and no matter how divergent their opinions, the successful ones are always right. You can't conceal bad food with darkness. The first smell or taste reveals it. But what about serving good food in darkness? My answer is, 'If the food is good, why hide it?'

It is possible to make food more appetizing in a comfortable atmosphere. Feder (1965) inferred that people may like to dine where there is food of a lesser quality if there are pleasant surroundings. They will seek places with atmosphere and attribute the lesser food quality to a non-existent genius of a chef. Atmosphere can be hypnotic.

Feder emphasized that adequate lighting should be available at each table for artistic lighting of the food. A brightly lit room will bring out the stark reality of the food and destroy the romantic atmosphere. The best arrangement is to have proper lighting at each table and softer surrounding light at the

perimeter of the table. When the entire room is lit to insure sufficient light at each table, Feder says that it is monotonous and loses its intimacy and atmosphere.

Feder continued by stating that there are two things that should be avoided in lighting a restaurant: (1) light coming down from overhead that creates shadows under people's eyes and gives them a drawn and weary look; and (2) fluorescent lights that produce distortion and ruin the appearance of food; they light the entire area and can not be directed as can incandescent lights.

Borsenik (1965) reported a study conducted at Cornell University in which a panel ranked the various light sources and their effects on the appearance of food. Incandescent lighting ranked first, followed by a soft-white fluorescent.

According to Suarez-Solis (1965), color along with light affects the human mood, aids in creating atmosphere, and influences the sale of food.

Respondent Classification

Showalter (1959), in a market survey of the residents of Manhattan, classified respondents as business, professional, clerical sales, skilled, unskilled, retired, student families, and military. The composition of this 1959 sample was: business, 10%; professional, 19%; clerical sales, 14%; skilled, 12%; unskilled, 8%; retired, 15%; student families, 11%; and military, 12%.

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this survey was to determine what is wanted and/or needed by the residents of the City of Manhattan in food service facilities for dining out.

A questionnaire was developed to survey opinions of selected residents of Manhattan, Kansas and students of Kansas State University concerning the local restaurant facilities (Appendix B). Drive-in establishments were not included in this study.

Of the 22 questions, 11 concerned opinions of facilities, service, and atmosphere of present and desired eating establishments. Four pertained to the frequency of eating out and the anticipated cost of meals; two were to determine where the respondents want to eat; and two inquired about food quality and menu selection. Two questions concerning the desirability of cereal malt beverages and alcoholic beverages as an accompaniment to the meal also were included. Some of the questions used in the survey were based on personal interviews with the Executive Manager of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce and the Director of the Kansas University Endowment Association.

Information concerning the respondents was sought through questions about occupational and job title, marital status, age group, and income bracket. The occupational or professional stratification used was: white collar workers, blue collar workers, military, retired, and students. These categories were similar to those used in a market survey of Manhattan by Showalter (1959) except that business, professional, and clerical

sales were classified as white collar workers; skilled and unskilled as blue collar.

Selection of Respondents

Participants were selected by a systematic sampling method (Boyd and Westfal, 1964) of the residents of the City of Manhattan, Kansas, and students of Kansas State University. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Directory (1966) and the Kansas State University Student Directory (1967) were used as universe listings.

The sample of residents was selected by using a sampling interval of every fourteenth resident whose phone number was listed and by an interval of every 111 names in the Student Directory.

A total of 500 names (400 residents and 100 students) was believed to be representative of the approximately 23,000 residents of Manhattan and 11,000 students of Kansas State University.

Clarity of the questionnaire was pretested by ten persons chosen from the faculty and student body who were not included in the study. The questionnaire, stamped, addressed, return envelope and cover letter were mailed to members of the selected sample. A 17-day period was allowed for completing and returning the questionnaire. Of the 500 questionnaires mailed, 250 (50%) were returned. Forty-one were not usable because they were incomplete, leaving a total of 209 (146 residents and 63 students) to be considered in the study.

Statistical Analysis

Returned and completed questionnaires were coded and recorded on computer cards. Answers were tabulated on a card sorter with a counting device and percentages were figured. Chi-squares were used to test the significance of certain responses by sample strata.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Selected questions pertaining to respondents' preferences and opinions toward local food service facilities, desired services and facilities, and general respondent attitudes were analyzed. Detailed statistical analysis is shown in Appendix A.

Of interest, but not used in the analysis, were the detailed demographic characteristics of the 209 respondents. Ninety-five (45.5%) were white collar workers, 29 (13.9%) blue collar workers, 63 (30.1%) students, 15 (7.2%) retired, and 7 (3.3%) military (Table 1). In comparison, the sample in Showalter's (1959) study consisted of: white collar workers, 43%; blue collar workers, 20%; retired, 15%; student families, 11%; and military, 33%.

The strata of military and retired were considered too small to be significant for statistical analysis by the Department of Statistics, Kansas State University. For the purpose of discussion, however, both groups are considered.

Table 1. Age, marital status, and income of respondents.

Classification	Age						Marital status			
	:18-	22-	26-	31-	46-	Over	Single		Married	
	:21	25	30	45	60	60	: No.	%	: No.	%
White collar	0	5	14	32	31	13	14	14.7	81	85.3
Blue collar	1	1	3	12	11	1	2	6.9	27	93.1
Student	37	20	6	-	-	-	47	74.6	16	25.4
Retired	-	-	-	-	1	14	7	46.7	8	53.3
Military	-	1	3	2	-	1	-	-	7	100.0
Total	38	27	26	46	43	29	70		139	
Per cent	18.2	12.9	12.4	22.0	20.6	13.9		33.5		66.5

Income						Total by classification	
Under \$4,000	\$4,000-\$5,999	\$6,000-\$7,999	\$8,000-\$9,999	\$10,000-\$11,999	Over \$12,000	No.	%
1	7	14	21	15	37	95	45.5
1	9	4	9	5	1	29	13.9
48	12	1	-	-	2	63	30.1
8	4	2	-	1	-	15	7.2
-	3	-	2	2	-	7	3.3
58	35	21	32	23	40	209	100.0
27.8	16.7	10.1	15.3	22.0	19.1		100.0

Frequency of Dining Out

Single respondents ate out more frequently as individuals and socially than did their married counterparts (Table 2). This is not surprising as the single respondent may prefer to eat out rather than cook his own meal. The average of 5.0 social meals per month for the single person in contrast to 1.3 for the married respondent may be attributed, in a large part, to dating. As would be expected, the married group ate many more meals as a family than the single group (2.9 to 0.13 per month).

Opinions of Present Facilities

Opinions of the present food service facilities in Manhattan are shown in Table 3. The seven questions pertained to: menu prices, types of establishments patronized, adequacy of choice of facilities, availability of parking, cleanliness, food quality, and the image of waiters and waitresses.

A large percentage of respondents (81.8%) indicated that prices charged by eating establishments were reasonable. Comments by respondents indicated, however, that the question was an over generalization, as the cost depends on the type of establishment. One respondent checked the category "inexpensive" and stated, "Not high in price but because of the poor quality for the price you pay."

It was interesting that almost one third (29.7%) of the respondents patronized a private club for their meals and cited quality, service, and availability of liquor as reasons for eating there.

Table 2. Average number of meals eaten out per month.

Classification	Single			Married		
	: As an : indi- : vidual	: As a : family	: For : Socially: ness	: As an : indi- : vidual	: As a : family	: For : Socially: ness
White collar	9.4	-	4.3	3.1	6.5	3.2
Blue collar	23.5	-	-	-	4.1	3.1
Student	7.4	0.5	3.3	-	2.6	2.2
Retired	9.9	-	4.4	0.1	4.0	2.1
Military	-	-	-	-	0.4	1.3
Average	12.6	0.13	5.0	0.8	4.3	2.9
						1.3
						0.5

Table 3. Opinions of present food service facilities.

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	Stu- : dent :	Re- : tired:	Mili- : tary :	Total No.	%
Menu prices							
Reasonable	84	23	47	12	5	171	81.8
Expensive	10	6	16	3	2	37	17.8
Inexpensive	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Establishments patronized							
Private club	44	14	3	3	6	70	29.7
Club members who also eat in public restaurants	26	10	3	3	6	48	68.5
Dine out of town	23	5	2	5	-	35	16.7
Public restaurants	81	26	63	15	7	192	91.9
Adequate choice of facilities							
Yes	58	9	23	9	7	72	34.4
No	71	20	40	6	-	137	65.5
Ample parking							
Yes	58	8	24	7	3	100	47.9
No	37	21	39	8	4	109	52.1
Cleanliness							
They are clean	14	1	4	5	2	26	12.4
Most are clean	57	14	40	6	3	119	56.9
Some are clean	16	10	16	5	2	49	23.4
Few are clean	5	3	2	-	-	10	4.8
No opinion	3	1	1	-	-	5	2.4
Food quality							
Good	17	5	9	7	1	39	18.7
Average or acceptable	66	22	49	8	6	151	72.2
Poor	12	2	5	-	-	19	9.1
Waiters and waitresses							
Efficient	9	2	10	3	1	25	12.0
Average	80	26	44	10	6	166	79.4
Inefficient	6	1	9	2	-	18	8.6
Friendly	49	18	33	11	6	117	56.0
Unfriendly	9	4	20	-	-	33	15.8
No opinion	37	5	12	4	1	59	28.2
Neat and clean	59	15	29	10	4	117	56.0
Untidy	5	5	14	2	-	26	12.4
No opinion	31	9	20	3	3	66	31.6

Manhattan does not offer enough choice or variety in food service facilities, according to 65.5% of the respondents. This viewpoint was not unanimous, though, as two groups (retired and military) were satisfied with the adequacy and variety of the local facilities. It must be considered that Fort Riley's Officer's Club is available to the military group.

Almost half of the group thought the parking facilities were adequate (47.9%). As might be expected, comments from respondents indicated the parking was less adequate downtown.

Although 119 respondents (56.9%) stated that Manhattan restaurants were clean, only 12.4% appeared willing to state that all were clean. Ten (4.8%) indicated that few places were clean.

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of food as good, average, or acceptable, or poor. The consensus was that the quality was average or acceptable, as expressed by 72.2% of the respondents.

To determine the image of local waiters and waitresses, respondents were asked to check statements pertaining to efficiency, friendliness, and appearance. The description gained from this question was that local servers were average in efficiency (79.4%), friendly (56.0%), and neat and clean (56.0%).

Meal Prices

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest price they would be willing to pay for a luncheon and an evening meal under these conditions: as an individual, as a family, socially, and for business reasons.

Most respondents (51.9%) were willing to pay up to \$1.00 for lunch when they ate out as an individual (Table 4). Sixty-eight (37.6%) would pay as much as \$2.00 for their lunch. Apparently, a person was not willing to pay as much for a meal when he ate by himself as when he ate out as a family, socially, or for business reasons. The price most mentioned, other than individual meals, was \$2.00.

Respondents would pay about \$1.00 more for their evening meals than for lunch. Dinner eaten as an individual continued to be the meal for which respondents were less willing to spend their money.

As might be expected, the retired group appeared to be the most conservative. Only one respondent (6.6%) was willing to pay up to \$4.00 for a luncheon (as a family) and up to \$5.00 for a dinner meal (as a family).

Desired Food Service Facilities

Responses to seven questions concerning the wants and/or needs for additional food service facilities are given in Table 5. The topics related to additional facilities needed, desired menu selection, decor preference, lighting, dinner music, table setting, and closing hours.

Anticipating that respondents would consider local eating facilities inadequate (65.5%), a question was asked to determine what kind of additional facilities they would like to see in Manhattan. The majority (43.1%) indicated a need for more waiter-table service restaurants. Sixty-three (22.3%) preferred buffets

Table 4. Maximum price respondents are willing to pay for meals.

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	Stu-: dent:	Re-: tired:	Mili-: tary :	Total No.	%
Luncheon							
As an individual							
Up to \$1	50	12	26	4	2	94	51.9
\$2	34	8	21	4	1	68	37.6
\$3	7	1	3	-	4	15	8.3
\$4	2	-	2	-	-	4	2.2
Over \$4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As a family							
Up to \$1	11	5	9	1	1	27	17.8
\$2	26	12	15	1	2	56	36.8
\$3	21	3	12	1	1	38	25.0
\$4	10	3	3	1	1	18	11.8
Over \$4	7	1	4	-	1	13	8.6
Socially							
Up to \$1	5	-	9	-	-	14	9.8
\$2	35	9	21	3	1	69	48.2
\$3	17	3	9	2	3	34	23.8
\$4	1	4	6	-	-	11	7.7
Over \$4	8	2	3	-	2	15	10.5
Business							
Up to \$1	13	1	-	2	-	16	15.2
\$2	22	6	11	1	-	40	38.1
\$3	16	1	10	3	2	32	30.5
\$4	2	1	3	-	-	6	5.7
Over \$4	3	2	5	-	1	11	10.5
Dinner							
As an individual							
Up to \$2	24	9	32	2	-	67	40.9
\$3	24	8	14	6	5	57	34.8
\$4	12	1	10	-	-	23	14.0
\$5	7	1	6	-	1	15	9.1
Over \$5	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.2
As a family							
Up to \$2	18	7	10	1	-	36	22.9
\$3	25	8	18	1	2	54	34.4
\$4	12	4	10	-	1	27	17.2
\$5	11	2	4	1	-	18	11.5
Over \$5	14	3	3	-	2	22	14.0

Table 4 (cont.)

		: White : collar:	: Blue : collar:	: Stu- : dent:	: Re- : tired:	: Mili- : tary :	Total No.	%
Socially								
Up to \$2	6	2	11	-	-	19	12.9	
\$3	10	8	17	1	1	37	24.8	
\$4	15	8	6	5	2	36	24.2	
\$5	14	7	8	-	-	29	19.5	
Over \$5	14	3	10	-	1	28	18.8	
Business								
Up to \$2	7	2	2	2	-	13	13.0	
\$3	13	4	4	1	-	22	22.0	
\$4	21	5	6	-	-	32	32.0	
\$5	9	4	5	-	1	19	19.0	
Over \$5	7	2	5	-	-	14	14.0	

Table 5. Kinds of additional food service facilities desired in Manhattan.

		: White : collar:	: Blue : collar:	: Stu- : dent:	: Re- : tired:	: Mili- : tary :	Total No.	%
Type of facility								
Cafeteria	15	9	22	7	2	55	19.5	
Waiter-table service	65	12	38	5	4	124	43.1	
Buffets	22	9	24	4	4	63	22.3	
Short order cafes	6	1	5	1	1	14	4.9	
Other	13	3	5	3	2	26	9.2	
Type of menu								
Steak house	54	14	48	6	4	126	30.3	
Foreign food	53	10	31	3	4	101	24.3	
Continental gourmet	30	4	15	2	5	54	13.0	
Coffee and sandwich shop	19	3	16	3	-	41	9.8	
Home style	26	17	27	11	2	83	20.0	
Other	7	1	3	-	-	11	2.6	

Table 5 (cont.)

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	Stu- : dent:	Re- : tired:	Mili- : tary :	Total No.	%
Type of decor							
Early American	24	8	15	1	-	48	23.0
Danish modern	15	4	6	1	2	28	13.4
Rustic or western	8	9	9	1	1	28	13.4
Provincial	20	2	10	1	1	34	16.3
Contemporary	13	4	22	8	3	50	25.9
Other	15	2	1	5	-	21	10.0
Lighting							
Lunch							
Bright	44	11	39	6	2	102	48.8
Soft	49	14	22	8	5	98	46.9
Candle	1	1	1	1	-	4	1.9
Other	1	3	1	-	-	5	2.4
Dinner							
Bright	4	1	1	3	-	9	4.3
Soft	71	19	39	10	3	142	67.9
Candle	20	9	23	2	4	58	27.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0
Dinner music							
Organ	21	10	3	5	3	42	20.1
Piano	9	3	5	1	-	18	8.6
No music	10	22	5	-	-	17	8.1
Juke box	1	2	-	-	-	3	1.4
Other	11	2	2	-	-	15	7.2
Recorded instru- mental	43	10	48	9	4	114	54.5
Table cover							
Linon	64	21	42	9	5	141	67.5
Paper	11	4	6	2	-	23	11.0
No preference	20	5	15	4	1	45	21.5
Closing hours							
7 p.m.	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.5
8 p.m.	10	2	3	4	-	19	9.1
9 p.m.	28	4	4	2	-	38	18.3
10 p.m.	23	8	15	6	1	52	25.0
11 p.m.	13	5	5	1	3	27	13.0
Midnight	19	9	26	1	3	58	27.9
Other	2	1	10	-	-	13	6.2

Table 5 (concl.)

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	Stu-: dent:	Re-: tired:	Mili-: tary :	Total No.	%
Effect of desired food service facilities on dining frequency							
Eat out more often	47	14	36	6	5	108	57.7
No change	48	15	27	9	2	101	48.3
Less often	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0

as an addition to present food services. Four of the five groups indicated a need for table service restaurants. The one group not selecting table service was the retirees, with seven (46.6%) wanting additional cafeterias. Senior citizens might have been expected to prefer being served to standing in line and carrying cafeteria trays.

In response to a query on type of menu preferred, 126 (30.3%) respondents cited a steak house type, 101 (24.3%) a foreign food menu, and 83 (20.0%) home style. It was interesting to note the apparent desire for a menu of foreign foods, which follows Motto's (1965) hypothesis that today's highly traveled consumer is becoming more sophisticated in his eating habits. It was not possible to tell the kind of foreign food preferred from the question as it was stated. A distinct preference for any certain type of decor was not evident in the responses, but Contemporary (23.9%) and Early American (23.0%) decor were very close for first and second place choices, followed closely by Provincial (16.3%). Comments indicate that the type of decor is

not as important as the taste in which it is done.

Intensity of lighting for a noon meal made little difference (bright light, 48.8% or soft light, 46.9%), but there was definite preference for the dinner meal. Soft lighting was by far most desired for the evening meal, 67.9%, but candle light was considered desirable by only 27.8% of the respondents.

Recorded instrumental dinner music (54.5%) was most preferred, with organ music (20.1%) next in popularity. Consensus of the written comments was that no matter what type of music was offered, it should be quiet, restful background music that does not interfere with conversation.

Most of the respondents (67.5%) favored linen table covers, but it was surprising that 21.5% had no preference.

Answers to the question of closing hours varied among the five groups. The time most frequently mentioned by white collar workers was 9 p.m. and by retired, 10 p.m. Blue collar, student, and military groups favored a midnight closing hour. To see if availability of new food service facilities would have a bearing on the frequency of dining out, respondents were asked if they would eat out more often, not change frequency, or eat out less often if the facilities they indicated were available (Table 5). Slightly more than half of the total sample (57.7%) anticipated an increase in the number of times they would eat out, and 48.3% did not think they would change their present patterns. As was expected, no respondents said they would reduce the number of times. This question was used as a check to see if answers were of a serious nature.

Service of Alcoholic and Cereal Malt Beverages

The question concerning service of alcoholic beverages in an eating place was included because of its controversial nature in the semi-dry State of Kansas. A majority (70.8%) of those surveyed indicated a preference for a drink with their meal (Table 6). The only group not favoring liquor service was the retired group.

Table 6. Service of alcoholic and cereal malt beverages with meals.

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	Stu- : dent:	Re- : tired:	Mili- : tary :	Total No.	%
Alcoholic beverages							
Yes	70	21	47	4	6	148	70.8
No	25	8	16	11	1	61	29.2
% Yes	73.7	73.4	74.6	26.7	85.7		
Cereal malt beverages							
Yes	12	5	13	2	1	33	15.9
No	83	23	50	13	6	175	84.1
% Yes	12.6	17.9	20.6	13.3	16.7		

Although liquor service was desired by many respondents, only 15.9% preferred beverages with a meal.

Characteristics of a Good Eating Establishment

Respondents were asked to rank the following characteristics in order of their importance: cleanliness, service, food, appearance and atmospheres, and prices. A score was determined for each characteristic by multiplying the rank by the number of respondents

Table 7. Characteristics of a good food service.

Characteristic	White : collar :	Blue : collar :	Student : collar :	Re-tired :	Military :	Total	Rank	Score
Food	48	8	36	2	3	97	1	97
	41	15	20	10	2	88	2	176
	5	6	5	3	1	20	3	60
	-	-	5	-	1	3	4	12
	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	0
								345
Cleanliness	45	16	25	11	3	100	1	100
	25	6	18	2	1	52	2	104
	15	4	9	-	1	29	3	87
	7	3	7	1	-	18	4	72
	3	-	4	1	2	10	5	50
								413
Atmosphere and appearance	-	3	1	2	-	6	1	6
	9	1	9	-	2	21	2	42
	20	6	15	2	1	44	3	132
	31	11	20	6	3	71	4	284
	35	8	18	5	1	62	5	310
								774
Service	2	1	1	-	-	3	1	3
	14	3	16	2	2	37	2	74
	40	13	32	5	3	93	3	279
	32	6	26	6	2	72	4	288
	7	5	16	2	-	30	5	150
								794
Price	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	2
	6	3	3	1	-	11	2	22
	15	1	15	4	1	36	3	108
	25	9	13	3	1	51	4	204
	49	15	31	7	4	106	5	530
								866

assigning that rank to the characteristic. Although cleanliness was ranked first by the largest number of respondents, it was second in overall importance to food. Food and cleanliness were by far the most important traits looked for in a place to dine, with atmosphere, service, and prices following in that order.

Compared to the Standard Brands survey (1958), the local group showed a greater concern for food, a lesser emphasis on cleanliness, but the same concern for atmosphere and appearance, service, and prices.

Statistical Significance

Chi-square was used to statistically analyze selected questions. The strata of retired and military were not used in the analysis, as they were considered to be too small a sample to be significant.

Responses from participants in the white collar, blue collar, and student groups concerning additional facilities desired, menu selection, lighting for the evening meal, preferences for alcoholic and cereal meal beverages were not significant.

Statistically significant at the 5% level were replies pertaining to frequency of eating out as related to marital status, the cleanliness of Manhattan's eating establishments, decor, lighting for the noon meal, preference on dinner music, and closing hours (Appendix A).

SUMMARY

Selected residents of the City of Manhattan, Kansas and students of Kansas State University were surveyed concerning their wants and/or desires for local food service facilities. Of 500 questionnaires mailed, 209 (41.8%) were returned and usable for the study. Ninety-five (45.5%) of the respondents were classified as white collar workers, 29 (13.9%) as blue collar workers, 63 (30.1%) as students, 15 (7.2%) as retired, and 7 (3.3%) as military.

In response to questions concerning their frequency of dining out, respondents indicated that unmarried population ate out an average of 12.6 times per month as compared to their married counterparts, who ate out 4.3 times as individuals; 5.0 times to 2.9 times socially; 0.13 to 2.9 times as a family; and 0.8 to 0.5 times for business reasons.

Respondents were willing to pay up to \$1.00 for lunch and \$2.00 for dinner when they ate out as individuals; \$2.00 and \$3.00 for family meals; \$2.00 for noon meals and \$3.00 for dinner on social events; and \$2.00 for luncheons and \$4.00 for evening business meals.

Seventy (29.7%) respondents belonged to a private club (fraternal organization or country club) with a food service facility. Forty-eight (68.5%) of those belonging to a private club also ate in public restaurants. One hundred ninety-two ate in public restaurants, cafes, or cafeterias. Thirty-five (16.7%) indicated that they do not dine in Manhattan but go out of town.

A lack of adequate choice and variety of food service facilities in Manhattan was cited by 137 (65.5%) respondents.

Cleanliness of local eating places did not seem to be of much concern as 26 (12.4%) stated that local places were clean and 119 (58.9%) stated that most eating establishments were well-kept.

Availability of parking spaces provided by the local food services appeared to be inadequate as reported by 52.1% of the respondents.

Food quality was indicated as being the most important characteristic of a good food service, but 72.2% of the respondents believed the quality of food served in town was just average or acceptable.

Three traits of local waiters and waitresses were questioned. The description established was that employees were of average efficiency (79.4%), friendly (56.0%), and neat and clean (56.0%).

Respondents indicated that they would like to see additional eating places offering waiter-table service (43.1%), buffets (22.3%), and cafeterias (19.5%).

A steak house type menu was the most popular as indicated by 126 (30.3%). The desire for a foreign food menu was favored by 101 (24.3%) respondents.

No preference was given for any certain type of decor. The inference was that the decor was not important but that interior decoration should be done in good taste.

Intensity of lighting (soft or bright) was inconsequential for the noon meal. Lighting at dinner should be soft, according

to 67.9% of the respondents. Candle light was preferred by 27.8%.

A distinct preference was indicated for recorded instrumental music (54.5%). Live entertainment apparently was not too important as organ music was favored by only 20.1% and piano by 8.6%.

One hundred forty-one (67.5%) liked the use of linens compared to 23 (11.0%) who favored the use of paper placemats and napkins. Almost twice as many (21.5%) had no preference.

Most respondents indicated that food services should remain open until at least 10 p.m. to meet their needs. Fifty-two (25.0%) indicated a closing hour of 10 p.m.; 58 (27.9%) wanted service until midnight.

Liquor by the drink was favored by 148 (70.8%) of the respondents. The only group not in favor of alcoholic beverages was in the retired classification. Malt beverages, however, were desired by only 15.9%.

Respondents were asked to rank, according to their importance, the characteristics of cleanliness, service, food, atmosphere and appearance, and price, as they pertained to a good food service. The most important characteristic was food, followed by cleanliness. Atmosphere and appearance was next, closely followed by service. Price was in the last place.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits of this study, an "ideal food service" for the Manhattan area might be described.

The "ideal food service" would be a seated service restaurant with a steak house or foreign food menu. This restaurant could be decorated in any theme, as long as it was done in good taste. It would have a lighting system where the intensity of light could be adjusted from bright for luncheon to soft for the evening meal. Dinner music would be recorded instrumental but should be soft in volume. The restaurant should serve until at least 10 p.m. and should offer ample parking. Emphasis for this food service would be high quality food served in clean surroundings.

A need for re-evaluation of the state liquor laws could be inferred by the evident desire of respondents for a cocktail or other drink with their meal.

Indications were that residents and students were not satisfied with the present local food services. Results of this study could be used in evaluating present facilities and as a guideline for remodeling present operations and in planning new facilities.

Although this study was based on a representative sampling, the population strata from which the sample was drawn were virtually unknown and not necessarily truly representative of each classification. This study was general in content and could be expanded by probing into detailed menu preferences, location

or site preferences, comparison of private club and public restaurants, price and frequency of dining out as compared to family size and ages of children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is extended to Mrs. Grace Shugart, Head of the Department of Institutional Management, for her patience, encouragement, and expert assistance as major adviser; to members of the graduate committee, Mrs. Merna Ziegler and Dr. Richard Christ; to Mrs. Raymona Middleton; to Mr. Kenneth Heywood, Director of the K.S.U. Endowment Association; to Dr. Arthur Dayton for his help with the statistical analysis; and to Miss Marilyn Watson and Mrs. Patricia Espeland for their encouragement and patience.

LITERATURE CITED

- A study of dining out among 1024 housewives. 1956. Research Department, J. Walter Thompson Company, Chicago, Illinois.
- Anonymous. 1965. Designing for the market. Hotel Management Review, 9, 14.
- Anonymous. 1965. Today's challenges: satisfying the second appetite. Fast Food, 64 (10), 91.
- Backstrom, Charles H. 1963. Survey research. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Illinois.
- Baum, Joseph H. 1965. The customer wants quality. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (3), 74.
- Borsenik, Frank D. 1965. Artificial light and food. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (3), 74.
- Consumer panel on dining out habits and attitudes. 1958. Chase and Sanborn Division of Standard Brands, Inc. in cooperation with the National Restaurant Assoc.
- Davis, Lois G. 1964. Lunch preferences and buying habits of women office workers. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Dining out habits and attitudes. 1963. General Foods Corp. in cooperation with the National Restaurant Assoc., White Plains, New York.
- Feder, Abe. 1965. Atmosphere and lighting. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (3), 66.
- Gallup, George. 1962. Exclusive 1961 market data restaurant sales in 300 key business areas. Fast Food, 61 (2), 12.
- General Foods eating-out index and consumer attitudes survey, 1960. Sponsored by Institutional Products Division of General Foods Corp. in cooperation with the National Restaurant Assoc., Chicago.
- Gildea, Harry and David E. Labson. 1963. An overview of the food service industry. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 4 (2), 40.
- Greenaway, Donald. 1964. A community survey of restaurant dining habits. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 5 (2), 11.

- Howard, Dick. 1965. Let's kill a myth. Fast Food, 64 (10), 8.
- Levy, Sidney J. 1956. Some notes on dining out. Memo to H. O. Whiteside, J. Walter Thompson Company, Chicago.
- Motto, Marilyn. 1965. Prescription for interior design. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (3), 77.
- Porter, Sylvia. 1963. Eating out grows; home cooking on the way to being just a memory. Chicago Daily News, April 15. Chicago.
- Review and summary of the published literature on eating out. 1964. J. Walter Thompson Company, New York.
- Showalter, Donald. 1959. A retail shopping survey of Manhattan, Kansas. Engineering Experiment Station, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Stanton, William J. 1964. Fundamentals of marketing. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
- Suarez-Solis, Daniel. 1965. Color and human vision. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (3), 69.
- Szathmary, Louis. 1965. Food is the show. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6 (1), 43.
- Varney, Carleton. 1965. Designing for the market. Hotel Management Review, 3 (9), 14.
- Warfield, M. C. 1965. The outlook for the hotel-motel food service. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Admin. Quarterly, 6, (1), 22.

APPENDIX A

Question 2. Please indicate the conditions and give the approximate number of times a month that you eat out:
 (1) as an individual, (2) as a family, (3) socially (with friends), and (4) for business reasons.

Single Population

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi-square
As an individual	45	47	351	443	
As a family	-	-	25	25	
Socially	35	-	133	186	143.95*
For business reasons	<u>18</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>18</u>	
	96	47	529	672	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Married Population

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi-square
As an individual	459	110	41	610	
As a family	227	74	43	344	
Socially	105	30	11	146	52.56*
For business reasons	<u>144</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>158</u>	6 d.f.
	935	222	101	1258	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Question 8. What is your opinion of the cleanliness of the eating establishments in Manhattan?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
They are clean	14	1	4	19	
Most are clean	58	14	40	111	
Some are clean	16	10	16	42	35.65*
Few are clean	5	3	2	10	8 d.f.
No opinion	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	
	95	29	63	187	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Question 9. What kind of additional food service facilities would you like to see in Manhattan?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Cafeterias	15	9	22	46	
Waiter-table service	65	12	38	115	
Buffets	22	9	24	55	12.96
Short order cafes	6	1	5	12	ns.
Other	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>21</u>	
	121	34	94	249	

Question 10. When you do eat out, what type of menu selection would you like to have available?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Steak House	65	14	48	127	
Foreign food special- ity	53	10	31	94	
Continental gourmet	30	4	15	49	16.265
Coffee and sandwich shop	19	3	16	38	10 d.f.
Home style	26	17	27	70	ns.
Other	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11</u>	
	200	49	140	389	

Question 11. Check the type of decor that you like best.

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Early American	24	8	15	47	
Modern (Danish)	15	4	6	25	
Rustic or Western	8	9	9	25	28.366*
Provincial (French or Italian)	20	2	10	39	10 d.f.
Contemporary	13	4	22	39	
Other	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>18</u>	
	95	29	63	187	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Question 12. When you dine out, what kind of lighting do you prefer?

Lunch

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Bright lights	44	11	39	94	
Soft lights	49	14	22	85	16.859*
Candle lights	1	1	1	3	6 d.f.
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	
	95	29	63	187	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Dinner

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Bright lights	4	1	1	6	
Soft lights	71	19	39	129	5.194
Candle lights	20	9	23	52	.6 d.f. ns.
Other	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	
	95	29	63	187	

Question 13. What is your preference on dinner music?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Organ	21	10	3	34	
Piano	9	3	5	17	
Recorded instru- mental	43	10	48	101	31.210* 10 d.f.
No music at all	10	2	5	17	
Juke box	1	2	2	5	
Other	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>13</u>	
	95	29	63	187	

*Significant at the 5% level.

Question 14. If it were available, would you prefer an alcoholic beverage before or after your meal?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Yes	70	21	47	138	.54 2 d.f.
No	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>49</u>	ns.
	95	29	63	187	

Question 15. Do you prefer a cereal malt beverage (beer) with your meals?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
Yes	12	5	13	30	2.613 2 d.f. ns.
No	83	23	50	156	
	<u>95</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>186</u>	

Question 19. How late should eating establishments remain open to take care of your needs?

	: White : : collar:	Blue : collar:	: Student :	: Total :	: Chi- square
7 p.m.	-	-	-	-	23.45* 10 d.f.
8 p.m.	10	2	3	15	
9 p.m.	28	4	4	36	
10 p.m.	23	8	15	46	
11 p.m.	13	5	5	23	
Midnight	19	9	26	54	
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	
	95	29	62	187	

*Significant at the 5% level.

APPENDIX B

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Department of Institutional Management
Justin Hall

C
O
P
Y

I NEED YOUR ASSISTANCE!!

As part of my research for a Master's thesis, I am conducting a consumer survey. The purpose of this study is to determine what is wanted and/or needed by the residents of the City of Manhattan in food service facilities.

Your opinion is very important. I need your answers on the enclosed questionnaire to make this research valid.

Please do not sign your name or put your address on either the questionnaire or the stamped return envelope. This way, I will not know who has and who has not returned his completed questionnaire.

Your cooperation is very important and earnestly requested. Please fill out and mail this questionnaire by March 13, 1967.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Larry P. Bilotta
Graduate Research Assistant
Department of
Institutional Management

To: Head of Household,

Please answer the following questions and return in the enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope.

The following questions are concerned with dining out in a RESTAURANT or CAFETERIA. THEY DO NOT APPLY TO DRIVE-INS.

1. Do you ever eat out?

☐ Yes
☐ No

2. If yes, please indicate the conditions and give the approximate number of times a month that you do eat out. (Check any that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> as an individual	Number of times a month <input type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> as a family	Number of times a month <input type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> socially (with friends)	Number of times a month <input type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> for business reasons	Number of times a month <input type="text"/>

3. Do you think that the menu prices in Manhattan eating establishments are reasonable? (Check one)

☐ Yes, they are reasonable
☐ They are expensive
☐ They are inexpensive

4. What would be the most money that you would be willing to pay for each meal when you eat out under the following conditions. (Answer any that apply)

LUNCHEON:

As an individual	up to \$1 <input type="text"/> , \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , Over \$4 <input type="text"/>
As a family	up to \$1 <input type="text"/> , \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , Over \$4 <input type="text"/>
Socially	up to \$1 <input type="text"/> , \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , Over \$4 <input type="text"/>
Business reasons	up to \$1 <input type="text"/> , \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , Over \$4 <input type="text"/>

DINNER:

As an individual	up to \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , \$5 <input type="text"/> , Over \$5 <input type="text"/>
As a family	up to \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , \$5 <input type="text"/> , Over \$5 <input type="text"/>
Socially	up to \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , \$5 <input type="text"/> , Over \$5 <input type="text"/>
Business reasons	up to \$2 <input type="text"/> , \$3 <input type="text"/> , \$4 <input type="text"/> , \$5 <input type="text"/> , Over \$5 <input type="text"/>

5. When you eat out, what types of establishments do you patronize?

☐ Private Club (Fraternal Organization or Country Club)
☐ Public Restaurant, Cafe, or Cafeteria
☐ Do not dine out in Manhattan, but go out of town.

6. If you belong to a private club, do you prefer it over a public eating place?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, why? _____

7. Do you think that Manhattan has an adequate choice and variety of food service facilities?

☐ Yes
☐ No

8. What is your opinion of the cleanliness of the eating establishments in Manhattan?

☐ They are clean
☐ Most are clean
☐ Some are clean
☐ Few are clean
☐ No opinion

9. What kind of additional food service facilities would you like to see in Manhattan?

☐ Cafeterias
☐ Waiter-table service restaurants
☐ Buffets
☐ Short order cafes
☐ Other _____

10. When you do eat out, what type of menu selection would you like to have available? (Check any that apply)

☐ Steak House
☐ Foreign Food Speciality (Chinese, Italian, German, etc.)
☐ Continental Gourmet (foods prepared with flavorings of wines and brandies)
☐ Coffee and Sandwich Shop
☐ Home Style
☐ Other _____

11. Check the type of decor that you like best. (Check one)

☐ Early American
☐ Modern (Danish)
☐ Rustic or Western
☐ Provincial (French or Italian)
☐ Contemporary
☐ Other _____

12. When you dine out, what kind of lighting do you prefer?

FOR LUNCH

☐ Bright lights
☐ Soft lights
☐ Candle light
☐ Other _____

FOR DINNER

☐ Bright lights
☐ Soft lights
☐ Candle light
☐ Other _____

13. What is your preference on dinner music? (Check one)

☐ Organ
☐ Piano
☐ Recorded instrumental
☐ No music at all
☐ Juke box
☐ Other _____

14. If it were available, would you prefer an alcoholic beverage before or after your meal?

☐ Yes
☐ No

15. Do you prefer a cereal malt beverage (beer) with your meals?

☐ Yes
☐ No

16. Do you prefer to eat at an eating establishment that uses the following? (Check one)

☐ Linen napkins and table cloths
☐ Paper place mats and napkins
☐ No preference

17. Do the eating places in Manhattan offer enough parking spaces?

☐ Yes
☐ No

18. In your opinion, what is the quality of the food served in Manhattan?

☐ Good
☐ Average or acceptable
☐ Poor

19. How late should eating establishments remain open to take care or your needs? (Check one)

☐ 7 p.m.
☐ 8 p.m.
☐ 9 p.m.
☐ 10 p.m.

☐ 11 p.m.
☐ Midnight
☐ Other _____

20. How would you rate the waiters and waitresses in Manhattan?
(Check one in each column)

<input type="checkbox"/> Efficient	<input type="checkbox"/> Friendly	<input type="checkbox"/> Neat and clean
<input type="checkbox"/> Average	<input type="checkbox"/> Unfriendly	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not take care of
<input type="checkbox"/> Inefficient	<input type="checkbox"/> No opinion	<input type="checkbox"/> their appearance
		<input type="checkbox"/> No opinion

21. If the desires for eating establishments, that you have indicated above, were all available, would you

☐ Eat out more often?
☐ Not change your frequency of eating out?
☐ Eat out less often?

Please rank from 1 to 5, in the order of their importance, what you consider to be the characteristics of a good eating establishment.

☐ Cleanliness
☐ Service
☐ Food
☐ Appearance and atmosphere
☐ Prices

Please fill out this last section of personal information. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME TO THIS PAPER. ALL OF THIS INFORMATION IS TO BE CONFIDENTIAL.

I need your opinions (the questionnaire) and personal factors in order to classify the results of this survey.

Occupation _____ Job Title _____

Marital Status: ☐ Single ☐ Married

Your Age Group: 18-21 years, ☐ 22-25 years, ☐ 26-30 years,
☐ 31-45 years, ☐ 46-60 years, ☐ over 60 years of age.

Number of dependents _____. Ages of dependents _____.

Please check one of the following brackets to indicate your INCOME. If more than one person in the family works, please give the total income.

Less than \$4,000 ☐, \$4,000 to \$5,999 ☐, \$6,000 to \$7,999 ☐,
 \$8,000 to \$9,999 ☐, \$10,000 to \$11,999 ☐, Over \$12,000 ☐.

Thank you for taking the time out of your busy day to answer this questionnaire. This information is vital to the completion of my thesis and graduation requirements.

I would appreciate it if you would return this questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope before March 13, 1967.

A MARKET SURVEY OF FOOD SERVICE NEEDS
IN MANHATTAN, KANSAS

by

LARRY PAIGE BILOTTA

B. S., Kansas State University, 1962

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Institutional Management

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

A study of the wants and/or needs for food service facilities of the residents of Manhattan, Kansas was undertaken. A questionnaire, consisting of 22 questions, was developed to survey the opinions of the selected resident and student population.

The names of 400 residents and 100 Kansas State University students were selected randomly from the Southwestern Bell Telephone Directory (1966) and the Kansas State University Student Directory (1966-67) by use of a sampling interval. Questionnaire and cover letters were mailed to the selected sample.

Usable were 209 returned questionnaires. Respondents were stratified into job classifications: white collar, blue collar, student, retired, and military. The retired and military strata were too small to use statistically, but from the other three groups, responses to selected questions were analyzed using chi-square.

Respondents indicated that the unmarried population ate out an average of 12.6 times per month as compared to their married counterparts, who ate out 4.3 times as individuals, 5.0 times to 2.9 times socially; 0.13 to 2.9 times as a family, and 0.8 to 0.5 times for business reasons.

Lack of an adequate choice and variety of food service facilities in Manhattan was indicated by 137 (65.5%) respondents. One hundred nineteen (56.9%) thought that most eating establishments were clean. Parking was found to be inadequate by 65.5%

of the respondents. Local help was described as friendly (56.0%), neat and clean (56.0%), and of average efficiency (79.4%).

Indicating their desires for future facilities, respondents described the "ideal food service" for the Manhattan area. Most needed was a seated service restaurant (44.0%) with a menu based on a steak house (32.1%) or foreign foods (23.7%). The decor or theme of the restaurant was not important as long as it was done with good taste. Soft lighting for the evening meal (67.9%) was indicated along with soft background of recorded instrumental music (54.5%). A closing hour of no earlier than 10 p.m. was suggested.

Liquor by the drink received approval by 70.8% of residents answering the questionnaire. The only group not overwhelmingly in favor of alcoholic beverages was in the retired classification. Malt beverages, however, were not desired with meals, as 81.1% indicated no desire for malt beverages while they ate.

Respondents ranked the five characteristics of a good food service in order of their importance as: (1) food, (2) cleanliness, (3) atmosphere and appearance, (4) service, and (5) price.